DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 438 020 PS 027 696

AUTHOR	Marcotte, Lori P.
TITLE	A Guide to Universal Free School Breakfast Programs.
INSTITUTION	Tufts Univ., Medford, MA. Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy.
PUB DATE	1999-03-00
NOTE	29p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center on Hunger and Poverty, School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts Univ., 11 Curtis Ave., Medford, MA 02155. Tel: 617-627-3956.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Breakfast Programs; Child Health; Nutrition; *Program Development; Program Implementation; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Universal School Breakfast Program

ABSTRACT

This booklet provides information regarding the use of universal free breakfast programs and guidance to schools that wish to start such a program. Written for school officials and breakfast advocates, the guide discusses the benefits of a universal free school breakfast program, the options available, and basic operational issues, so that officials will be equipped to promote and implement such programs. Moreover, the document contains ideas from schools that have successful universal breakfast programs. The guide's sections cover: (1) a description of the School Breakfast Program; (2) the importance of breakfast; (3) the importance of universal free school breakfast programs; (4) how a universal school breakfast program works; (5) advantages of universal school breakfast programs (improves academic outcomes, removes stigma, raises awareness and participation, improves attendance and behavior, improves nutritional status, increases reimbursements, and reduces administrative burden); (6) getting started; (7) gaining support; and (8) program suggestions and promotional methods (promotions, transportation, staff, and creative service systems). Appendices cover alternative reporting methods, states with financial incentives, and calculating breakfast costs. (Contains 24 references.) (EV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PS

ED 438 020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Guide to Universal Free School Breakfast Programs

Lori P. Marcotte, MPH, MS, RD

March, 1999

J. Larry Brown

2A

CENTER ON HUNGER AND POVERTY

School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts University
11 Curtis Avenue • Medford, MA 02155 • (617) 627-3956

PS 027696

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	Page:
Introduction	1
The School Breakfast Program	1
The Importance of Breakfast	1
The Importance of Universal (Free) School Breakfast Programs	3
How a Universal School Breakfast Program Works	3
Advantages of Universal School Breakfast Programs	4
Improves Academic Outcomes	4
Removes Stigma	5
Raises Awareness and Participation	5
Improves Attendance and Behavior	6
Improves Nutritional Status	6
Increases Reimbursements	8
Reduces Administrative Burden	9
Getting Started	9
Gaining Support	11
Program Suggestions and Promotional Methods	11
Promotions	11
Transportation	13
Staff	14
Creative Service Systems	14
Conclusion	15
Appendix 1: Alternative Reporting Methods	17
Provisions I, II, and III, and State Use of Provisions	
Appendix 2: States with Financial Incentives	22
Appendix 3: Calculation of Breakfast Costs	23
References	24

Introduction

Successful advocacy efforts by state and local organizations, and collaborative partnerships between schools, teachers, parents, and community agencies have expanded participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) in recent years. Nearly three-fourths (73.4%) of schools that offer school lunch also offer breakfast (according to reports to the USDA by the states, 1/21/99). More schools may embrace breakfast as a critical component to the school day, but program coverage, especially among children at risk for hunger, still lags. Based on data reported to the USDA by the states, only 36 percent of the low-income children covered by school lunch were also covered by the breakfast program in October, 1998 (USDA report from the states, 1/21/99). An important step for child advocates and educators is to boost participation, and one proven method (Cook, Ohri-Vachaspati, and Kelly, 1996; and Murphy, Pagano, Nachmani, Sperling, Kane, and Kleinman, 1998) is to offer breakfast free to all students, regardless of their ability to pay for meals. This is so because a "universal" program removes the stigma often associated with school breakfast, enticing more children to participate.

This report provides information regarding the use of universal free breakfast programs, and guidance to schools that wish to start one. School officials and breakfast advocates will learn of the benefits of a universal free school breakfast program, the options available, and basic operational issues so that they will be equipped to promote and implement the program. Moreover, this document contains useful ideas from schools that have successful universal breakfast programs.

The School Breakfast Program

Established under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, the School Breakfast Program (SBP) operates similarly to the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) in that students are 'means tested' to determine their ability to pay for meals. Children whose households have incomes at or below 130 percent of poverty receive meals at no cost; children from households with incomes above 130 and up to 185 percent of the poverty level can obtain meals at a reduced cost (Federal Register, 63(50), March 16, 1998, pp. 12719-12722). All other children may pay the full price for meals, although, even for them, federal subsidies offset the actual cost. Families must submit applications so that schools can determine the category to which each child belongs, and schools must randomly verify the information received (7CFR, 245.5 (a)). One application accounts for both the lunch and breakfast programs, and children whose families participate in the Food Stamp Program or receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) can be directly certified as eligible for free meals (7CFR, 245.6a (a)(3)); that is, without completing an application for school meals.

The Importance of Breakfast

Breakfast is vital to meeting the National Education Goal, set by Congress in 1994, which states that "all children will start school ready to learn" (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Public Law 103-227 (108 Stat. 125)). Many educators interpret this goal as one that solely refers to pre-school and kindergarten programs which prepare children for grade school. In reality, the breakfast program helps prepare students for learning at all ages.

Breakfast works to counter the problem of "mild undernutrition," the most common form of malnutrition in the United States. Mild undernutrition is typically marked by periodic food insufficiencies and hunger, and affects an estimated 13.7 million American children (USDA, 1997). The impact of nutrient deprivation on a child's ability to develop physically and cognitively has been well documented over the years (Brown and Pollitt, 1996; Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, 1998; and Pollitt, 1998S).

Some effects of undernutrition are treatable, and early interventions can reap positive outcomes. Experimental studies have demonstrated the ability of breakfast to improve cognitive functions, including memory, verbal and visual skills, and reaction times (Pollitt, 1995). Breakfast can improve problem solving skills by giving the brain energy and reducing the metabolic stress associated with fasting (Pollitt, Cueto, and Jacoby, 1998S).

Ten years ago, Lawrence, Massachusetts -- a mill town with high rates of poverty -- conducted an interesting experiment. The school district started SBP in some, but not all, schools. During this unique trial, researchers had the opportunity to monitor the effects of the program on educational outcomes of participants versus non-participants. The results revealed that students who participated in the breakfast program demonstrated greater achievement on standardized tests than students who had no access to SBP (Myers, Sampson, Weitzman, Rogers, and Kayne, 1989). In addition to overall improvements in test scores, SBP participants experienced significant gains in language scores, as well as higher math and reading scores (although not necessarily statistically significant).

Other school-based studies have confirmed that well-fed children are more attentive in class, and show improvements on standardized tests (Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, 1998; and Pollitt et al, 1998), behavior (Murphy, et al, 1998; Kleinman, et al, 1998; and Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning, 1998) and rates of absence and tardiness (Cook, et al, 1996; and Murphy et al, 1998) when the SBP is available. Educational professionals, researchers and parents now have strong scientific grounding to conclude that, "hungry children can not learn."

Despite these benefits, approximately 24,000 public schools nation wide (according to a survey conducted by this Center) do not provide breakfast for their students. While some states mandate certain "high need" schools to serve breakfast, the majority of school districts are not required to offer the program, so many do not do so. The reasons for this vary. Many people believe that it is a program only for poor children, so schools with small proportions of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches may not feel it necessary to add another "service." Others consider it the parent's job to provide breakfast, or feel a breakfast program may be costly. Still other schools are limited by their own facilities or fear difficulties with alterations in bus, school and staff schedules. In short, many educators do not yet understand the implications of the recent scientific evidence: children *must* have a nourishing breakfast if they are to have a chance to learn.

States with SBP Mandates

Arkansas	Michigan
Florida	Minnesota
Georgia	Missouri
Indiana	New York
Iowa	Ohio
Kansas	Oregon
Louisiana	Rhode Island
Maryland	South Carolina
Tennessee	

The Importance of Universal (Free) Breakfast Programs

According to the latest USDA report, only 27 percent of children who eat lunch at school are able to participate in the SBP (based on reports to the USDA from the states, 1/21/99). As more schools offer the SBP, and as schools look for ways to increase participation, universal breakfast programs offer a solution. When a Universal School Breakfast Program is available, all students are eligible to eat at no cost. Removing the stigma of family income encourages more children to participate. Studies (Cook, et al, 1996; and Murphy, et al, 998) have demonstrated the ability of the Universal-SBP to increase participation by 80 percent or more. This is important for several reasons.

First, as more children participate, more children feel welcome. This benefits both poor and non-poor families. Parents with children eligible to pay for meals often report that the total fee for breakfast is cost prohibitive. Many families that qualify for reduced price meals have the same financial problem. When a Universal-SBP is initiated, these children can receive a nourishing breakfast without the cost burden to their families.

Secondly, children who eat at school act as role models in encouraging others to participate. Moreover, schools with creative approaches often build momentum for the program. The Dawson, Minnesota School District, for example, invites high school students to partake in breakfast at the elementary school. Younger students are thrilled to eat with older ones, while the older students gain appreciation for the importance of breakfast. Of course, school officials such as the superintendent, principal, or school board members can make positive statements when they occasionally eat breakfast at school with the children.

The primary benefit of the school breakfast program, however, is its effect on academic outcomes. The added effect of a Universal-SBP is that it impacts more children.

How a Universal School Breakfast Program Works

To institute a free breakfast program, school districts have two basic options.

The first option is to simply eliminate the pricing policy at breakfast. All of the necessary paperwork and applications are still collected for the lunch program, and the household income categories for students are noted, but no student pays for breakfast (although monies are still collected at lunch). Monthly participation reports for breakfast are submitted to the state agency as usual and the appropriate reimbursements are received by the school district.

Universal programs work best when approximately 75 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. This allows schools to use reimbursements for free or reduced-price meals to cover the income forfeited when meals are served free to students who otherwise would pay. Currently, about 800 schools in the nation offer this type of universal breakfast, including, for example, schools in Philadelphia (144 schools) and Kansas City, Missouri (74 schools).

A second option is to formally apply for an alternative reporting method. Such alternatives are known as "Provisions" and were devised by USDA to reduce paperwork in areas that serve high proportions of free and reduced-price meals. Schools must choose among Provisions I, II, and

III, and then gain approval from the state agency to use that reporting method. Schools that use the Provision system typically collect applications during the first year while serving breakfast at no cost. After this "base year," no applications are collected for at least two to four years (depending on which Provision is used and whether or not the school can obtain an extension -- refer to **Appendix 1** for detailed information). Provision II appears to be the most frequently selected option; more than 2800 schools nationwide use it, according to data collected by this Center.

Advantages of A Universal School Breakfast Program

No one will argue the fact that breakfast is important, and its role in learning is well established by a large body of empirical evidence. The benefits of Universal-SBP extend beyond academic outcomes, though this is the primary reason for administrators to support the program. A Universal-Free School Breakfast Program has the following advantages:

- Improves academic outcomes by providing the necessary energy and nutrients to support learning by more children;
- Removes stigma by removing cost differentiation;
- Improves awareness and raises participation by serving all children at no cost;
- Improves attendance and behavior by enticing children to arrive at school on time, and by providing nutrients which improve attentiveness;
- Improves nutritional status by providing varied meals that meet the USDA Dietary Guidelines;
- Increases reimbursements by serving more meals which maximizes the amount of federal funds received by the school; and
- Reduces administrative burden by simplifying the service system and, in many cases, reducing the paperwork.

Improves Academic Outcomes for More Children

It is easy to understand how undernutrition would limit a child's growth, but it also limits a child's cognitive functioning and learning potential (Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, 1998; Brown and Pollitt, 1996; and Morley and Lucas, 1997). Dietary insufficiency in a small body usually is debilitating. Iron deficiency anemia, for example, which affects 17 percent of low-income preschoolers (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1998), reduces a child's concentration and memory. Subsequently, impacted children may miss learning basic skills and are less prepared for grade school.

A strong body of research on the role of nutrition in learning point to the critical importance of the Universal-SBP. Fourth and fifth grade students in Baltimore and Philadelphia who participated in universal breakfast programs had significantly higher math scores than students who did not participate, or who participated infrequently (Murphy, et al, 1998). In Minnesota, where six schools were awarded grants to fund pilot Universal-SBP's, students who participated for three years had increases in composite math and reading percentile scores (Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning, 1998). As more schools utilize Universal-SBP, greater academic achievement among children is expected.

Removes Stigma

A universal program attracts more children thereby changing the notion that school breakfast is only a "poor children's program." Even though USDA mandates that children be served in a nondiscriminatory manner (7CFR, 245.8), there is often a stigma associated with school breakfast. This stigma serves to inhibit participation. On average, the SBP reaches only 36 percent of the low-income students who enjoy the NSLP (according to the USDA based on reports from the states, 1/21/99). Many youngsters, even if they are hungry, skip school breakfast because of its perception as a program for the needy. Focus groups with high school students have found that those who did not participate believed that the program was either for poor students or young ones (Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, 1996). Middle school students that participated in the SBP felt isolated or stigmatized, but recognized the importance of eating, especially if they had little food at home (Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, 1996).

Universal free breakfast programs remove most of the stigma by serving all students at no charge. Schools that initiate universal programs immediately notice an increase in participation rates. Removal of the stigma is not limited to students; it impacts parents as well. School administrators report that some parents avoid completion of the paperwork so that they will not be identified as needy. This occurs among families who cannot afford to pay for school meals, and even among families who struggle to obtain food at home.

Raises Awareness and Participation

Stigma is not the only barrier to greater participation rates; many parents do not realize that breakfast is served at their children's schools (Center on Hunger, Poverty, and Nutrition Policy, 1996), or that it is available to students of all income levels. It takes special efforts to raise awareness of any school program and when it comes to school meals, outreach is crucial. Superintendents and principals must be key advocates, especially when it comes to informing teachers of the importance of the SBP. Teachers who learn about the role of breakfast in academic performance particularly appreciate the SBP as a way to enhance their role as educator. Universal programs are viewed as a means to help all children learn.

Food service directors also can present information on the importance of breakfast and its relation to academic success at parent-teacher meetings or other school events. When parents understand the benefit of breakfast in general and school breakfast in particular, they are poised to support policies that address the SBP, and ensure that their children can participate. These efforts can be made regardless of the payment system used for meals, but when all children are able to enjoy this meal at no cost, it becomes easier to promote the program.

A rise in student participation is one outcome of awareness, outreach and promotional activities. A Universal-SBP not only increases participation, but it tends to do so among the most vulnerable children. In Central Falls, Rhode Island, a Universal-SBP increased participation primarily among poor children and young students (kindergarten through second-grade) (Cook, et al, 1996). In addition, after three years of the program, high school participation in this community has grown by 74 percent. High school students now expect breakfast and continue to participate, even at a time when many adolescents began to skip this meal (Siega-Riz, Popkin, and Carson, 1998). These outcomes are most dramatic when breakfast is served in the classroom.

Minnesota pilot schools, which typically had breakfast in the classroom, experienced participation rates as high as 93 percent (Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning, 1998).

Improves Attendance and Behavior

In addition to its impact on academic performance and participation rates, evaluations of universal school breakfast programs have found a significant reduction in absentee and tardiness rates (Cook, et al, 1996; and Murphy, et al, 1998), as well as trips to the nurse (Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning, 1998) and behavioral problems in the classroom, (Murphy, et al, 1998). These outcomes are appealing for two reasons.

First, children miss a lot of instruction if they are late to school or absent altogether. When Central Falls, Rhode Island started a Universal-SBP, the proportion of chronically tardy children decreased by 67 percent in schools with the Universal-SBP, while schools without the program actually experienced an increase in tardiness (Cook, et al, 1996). Frequent breakfast participants were half as likely to be absent or tardy than infrequent participants. These outcomes were replicated in Baltimore and Philadelphia where children who rarely ate school breakfast were absent and tardy significantly more frequently than children who ate often (Murphy, et al, 1998). Not only are more children present and on time, but children who eat more closely to the time of academic instruction are better equipped to concentrate on tasks (Vaisman, Voet, Akivis, and Vakil, 1996).

Second, children classified as "hungry" are significantly more likely to be dysfunctional, according to psychological tests, than non-hungry children (Kleinman, et al, 1998). Other psychological manifestations of hunger may include greater anxiety or depression and more aggressive behavior (Kleinman, et al, 1998; and Murphy, et al, 1998). In high-risk communities, a teacher may be faced with numerous classroom disturbances that limit each child's educational experience. Schools that serve breakfast in the classroom have found that teachers, who may at first be opposed to this duty, come to support the program once they see the impact that it has on their students (Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning, 1998).

Improves Nutritional Status

Studies show that a SBP makes a significant difference in nutrient intakes. Children who eat school breakfast consume more energy, vitamin A and calcium than children who eat at home or not at all (Nicklas, O'Neil, and Berenson, 1998; and Cook, et al, 1996). School districts that convert to a universal breakfast program thereby insure better nutritional well-being for more of their children. As part of the Bogalusa Heart Study, Nicklas and colleagues (1998) found that students who ate school breakfast were more likely to meet the RDA for vitamin D, magnesium, thiamine, riboflavin and zinc than children who ate at home. Similarly, an evaluation of the dietary intakes of students in Central Falls, Rhode Island (Cook, et al, 1996) found that school breakfast eaters consumed more nutrients, including vitamin A, calcium, and iron, than non-participants. School breakfast participants were less likely to have inadequate intakes of these nutrients than even the children who had breakfast at home.

Nutritional status impacts both health and learning. In fact, USDA regulations stipulate that school meals meet eight nutrient standards. These nutrients are: calories (energy), total fat,

saturated fat, protein, calcium, iron, vitamin A and vitamin C (7CFR 220.8 (a)(1) to (3)). School breakfast can help students consume the appropriate amounts of needed nutrients:

Calories provide energy through the consumption of carbohydrates, protein and fat. Energy is necessary for a child to grow, function, and develop. A school breakfast must provide one quarter of a child's total energy needs, based on the recommended dietary intake set for the particular age group (7CFR, 220.8(a)(1) and (2)). Food service directors can use approved nutrient analysis programs or menu plans to ensure that the menus meet the nutrient standards.

Protein is necessary for growth, and children who do not consume adequate protein may experience stunted height and, in severe cases, diminished immune function. Protein comes primarily from animal sources (meat, poultry, fish, and dairy products), as well as legumes (dried beans) and nuts or seeds (like peanuts). Protein is found in lesser amounts in vegetables and grains.

Fat is an energy-dense nutrient because it provides twice as many calories per gram as protein or carbohydrates. While intake should be limited, some fat is necessary for the proper development and function of nerves and hormones. School meals must meet the USDA Dietary Guidelines, which suggest that less than 30 percent of the total calories come from fat, and less than 10 percent of the total calories come from **saturated fat** (7CFR, 220.8(a)(3)(ii) and (iii)). Diets high in saturated fat are associated with greater serum cholesterol levels and increased risk of cardiovascular disease. Recent analyses of school breakfast consumption found that saturated fat intakes, primarily due to butter and whole milk, exceeded the USDA recommendations (Friedman and Hurd-Crixell, 1999), which means that school food service authorities need to develop menus which better meet the dietary guidelines.

Iron is a critical nutrient that transports oxygen through the blood and helps to fight infections. A child who is iron deficient is more likely to be lethargic and have difficulty concentrating. Anemia in infancy may impact cognitive development over a longer period than deficiencies at other ages (Morley and Lucas, 1997). If left untreated, iron deficiency anemia can reduce brain development and learning ability (Brown and Pollitt, 1996). While animal sources such as red meat contain significant amounts of iron, low-cost sources of this mineral can be obtained from kidney beans and fortified cereals and breads.

Vitamin C fights infections, maintains healthy skin, and aids in the absorption of iron. Though this vitamin can be found in many fruits and vegetables that children like, there is an inverse relationship between fruit and vegetable consumption and income (Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, 1995), with few low-income children meeting the recommended servings (Munoz, Krebs-Smith, Ballard-Barbash, and Cleveland, 1997). Vitamin C cannot be stored in the body, so it must be consumed daily.

Vitamin A, another antioxidant, is also plentiful in fruits and vegetables and thus its intake is associated with income status (Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, 1995). Vitamin A is necessary for vision and bone growth, and severe deficiencies can cause neurological damage.

Calcium intakes are greater in school breakfast eaters (Cook, et al, 1996; and Nicklas, et al, 1998) since milk is always served. Calcium forms bone and aids in muscle

contractions. Since experts view osteoporosis as a childhood disease with later adult manifestations, developing the habit of drinking milk at an early age can aid in prevention. Recent data show that the median intake of calcium by adolescents of virtually all ethnic backgrounds is less than the Recommended Dietary Allowance (Munoz, et al, 1997).

Zinc, though not a "critical nutrient," is a mineral needed for growth and immune functions, and it can affect learning and behavior. Mild zinc deficiencies can lead to mental lethargy and impaired immune response, increasing the likelihood that a child will become sick and miss school (Whitney and Rolfes, 1993).

Increases Reimbursements

For school administrators, there is an important financial benefit that comes with a Universal-SBP: more money coming into the district. This comes about for two reasons.

First, universal breakfast programs increase student participation in this morning meal. For example, when the Lakeworth County, Texas school district started its program, participation rose from 25 to 100 percent in each of its schools during the first year alone. As a result, the district doubled the amount of federal reimbursements received.

Second, because schools receive reimbursements for free, reduced-, and full-price meals, districts increasing participation among free, and reduced-price youngsters receive even more in federal reimbursements. Districts having over 40 percent of children eligible for free or reduced-price meals are considered "severe need" (7CFR, 220.10(b), (c), (d), and (e)) and thus get reimbursed by the federal government at a higher rate than they otherwise would for the same meals (see the table below). Most state agencies estimate that the districts will "break even" on costs if they have 75 percent or more of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals; many districts, however, successfully operate programs with even lower percentages.

Payment Category	Eligibility Guideline (given family income)	Federal per-meal Reimbursement	Severe-Need Reimbursement
Free	<130% of poverty	$1.0725	$1.2775
Reduced-Price	130 - 185% of poverty	$0.7725	$0.9775
Full-Price	>185% of poverty	$0.2000	$0.2000

In many instances, schools enjoy greater program integrity given the rise in revenues that result from increases in participation. For instance, food service directors find that they can upgrade equipment and make other improvements in their department with the reimbursement funds. For schools that do not have a high proportion of free and reduced-price meals, state funds or private donations sometimes offset the cost of the meals (refer to **Appendix 2** for a list of states with financial incentives). Three states (Massachusetts, Maryland, and Minnesota) provide grant funding to help schools run pilot universal breakfast programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reduces Administrative Burden

Schools that take advantage of program provisions (described in Appendix 1) typically save in labor costs by not processing applications. This is possible because food service directors use the percentage of free, reduced-price and paid meals from the "base year" and apply it to the monthly participation numbers in subsequent "non-base years." Not only does this reduce the paperwork, but daily meal counts are also eliminated, which may reduce staff needs during breakfast. The cashier position, for example, can be assigned to assist with supervision, instead of hiring teachers' aids or altering teachers' schedules; alternatively, the position could be eliminated through attrition.

For other savings, schools that use the Provision method at both breakfast and lunch no longer have to pay for the maintenance of an electronic cash register, other computer systems, or student meal cards. These costs are usually not considered in the initial planning stages but emerge after the first or second year of the program. Finally, since administrative staff no longer need to process applications, they gain time to offer programmatic assistance. Simply avoiding the preparation, distribution and collection of this paperwork can significantly reduce costs associated with the school meals program. For instance, Bridgeport, Connecticut reduced the number of applications processed from 30,000 to under 6000 per year. Now, only new students need to complete applications.

It is to be noted that whether or not staffing needs decline, the other benefits of a Universal program remain. Moreover, there may be some benefit to collecting student applications even with the program. While schools that use Provisions only for breakfast still need to collect applications for the NSLP, other schools may need to collect applications annually to qualify for Title I funding. According to guidance issued by the USDA (November 18, 1998), state department of education Title I officials will accept the applications that are on file from the base year. However, individual state agencies may need to be refreshed on this policy so that schools using a Provision for the school meals would not need to collect applications for Title I funding.

Getting Started

The primary consideration for any food service director and school administrator is whether a universal breakfast program is economically feasible. One basic calculation considers the actual reimbursement received, and the average cost of food, supplies, and labor, based on current participation rates. Administrators use these numbers to determine the ability to cover costs using federal meal reimbursements (**Appendix 3** provides an example).

Alternatively, the Food Service Director of the Tacoma, Washington Schools suggests that using *total* enrollment information is the easiest method. In this case, multiplying the reimbursement rates by the number of students in each category (free, reduced or paid), then adding each category together and dividing by the number of meals served, based on the school's total enrollment, results in the average reimbursement paid per meal served. This average reimbursement may be used to determine whether or not the average food and labor costs would be covered (refer to Appendix 3 for an example). Of course, one can expect less than 100 percent participation, but the proportion of students who do not eat is often similar in each

payment category. As more children participate, and as more free and reduced-price meals are served, the greater the financial cushion for the school or district.

These formulas determine basic cost benefit; some schools can take advantage of state funds that support the cost of supervision or provide additional subsidies for each meal served (refer to Appendix 2). Districts that utilize Provision I, II or III may also consider the savings in labor costs due to paperwork reduction, in addition to savings related to other indirect costs such as computer cards, or software upgrades. It is important to assess these costs before approaching administrators, since the cost effectiveness of any program is a major concern. Many directors recommend offering a universal program on a "trial" basis to avoid the feeling that the school is locked into the program, and to convince skeptics of program benefits through direct experience.

In addition to these financial considerations, the food service director must evaluate the school's facilities to determine the options available for implementation of a universal free program. Even if the school already offers breakfast, one can assume that greater participation rates may alter the way breakfast is served. The following areas should be evaluated:

1. The Cafeteria
   - Is it large enough to hold all of the students who will eat breakfast?
   - Should breakfast be staggered to accommodate large numbers?
   - Will some students need to eat in the classroom?
   - Are there other times or places that students can eat?

2. School Time
   - Does the school building open early enough to allow time for the students to eat?
   - Can the start of the school day be modified slightly?
   - Can class schedules be altered to allow for a mid-morning breakfast break?

3. Transportation
   - Do the buses arrive in time for students to eat before class?
   - Can bus schedules be modified? If not, can the start of school be pushed back?
   - Can buses be staggered so children do not arrive at the same time?
   - Do most children walk or get rides to school? Do these children arrive on time?

4. Supervision
   - Do teacher contracts allow time in the morning for supervision of breakfast?
   - Can teacher schedules be altered to ensure adequate adult supervision? (Note that less supervision is needed at breakfast than at lunch because the meal is simpler, and children tend to be more subdued in the morning)
   - Should breakfast be part of the school day, either served in the classroom or in the cafeteria, but after the bell?
   - Who else is available to supervise? Consider food service staff, office staff, teachers' aides, and community volunteers.

Gaining Support

Perhaps the greatest factor in the success of a universal program is the level of support given by school administrators. A supportive district superintendent and an enthusiastic school principal are key. To gain support, food service directors, often in collaboration with the state department of education's child nutrition specialist, can present the benefits of a Universal-SBP to superintendents, principals, and school boards. These players should be informed not only of the role that nutrition plays in learning, but how a Universal-SBP can translate into improved academic achievement for more children, and about the various solutions available to address perceived barriers in individual schools.

Once the administration supports the program, the support of teachers and food service staff is needed. Teachers initially may feel ambivalent about direct involvement, especially if the meal is served in the classroom or requires their help via supervisory roles. It is crucial that food service directors form partnerships with teachers, and this often involves approaching teachers unions and working with the Superintendent to arrange systems that work for all parties. Clearly, the more flexible the school, the more successful the program. For instance, some schools cater to the teachers by serving breakfast in the classroom upon request, while arranging for other classes to either eat before school or shortly after the bell rings. Time after time, directors report that previously skeptical teachers come to favor the program once they see the positive effect that it has on their students.

All school staff, from the principals to the custodians, influence the success of a universal program, but the food service workers may have the greatest impact on the level of participation. The food service staff are empowered to design programs that appeal to students and to conduct activities that entice students to come inside for breakfast. There are many ways for schools to maximize the number of children participating, and the following section describes creative approaches to school breakfast promotions.

Program Suggestions and Promotional Methods

Once you decide that a universal free breakfast program makes fiscal sense and you have the necessary backing, it is time to plan for its implementation and promotion.

Promotions --

State-wide Programs

In Rhode Island, *Kids First* works to support schools in their implementation and promotion of the SBP. This non-profit organization joined in partnership with USDA's Team Nutrition Training Institute and other groups to "ensure that Rhode Island children have adequate nutrition to promote their health and cognitive development." *Kids First* conducts various activities in the schools to address awareness, education and outreach. The following examples have been used successfully by *Kids First* (Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, 1996) and other schools around the country.

Breakfast Clubs

Elementary school children particularly enjoy the Breakfast Club promotion. After a festive kick-off event, children who are members receive prizes for eating breakfast and they enjoy special meals throughout the year. This concept is not limited to Rhode Island. In Chicopee, Massachusetts, grant funding was used to purchase special plates and table cloths that are reserved for "Breakfast Club Members." Club members have cards to mark their participation, and can receive prizes, like tee-shirts or small incentives, after they eat breakfast 20 times. Overall, Breakfast Clubs give children an opportunity to socialize and have fun, all while enjoying a healthy meal.

Lucky Tray Days

Another popular elementary school promotion, Lucky Tray Days afford small prizes to the child who receives a "lucky tray" (a chance outcome based on a number or a notation on the bottom of the tray). Since this day could occur each month, prizes are simple; an eraser, special pencil, button or sticker all work well.

Bring a Friend to Breakfast

A demonstrably successful way to pull children into breakfast, students can bring a new friend to breakfast and they may receive a small prize (pencil or eraser), or enjoy a special menu. To expand on this idea, schools invite parents to share breakfast with their children, which also raises adult awareness of the program.

Raffles

Students who eat breakfast every day of the week, or month, are eligible for special raffles. Community groups or local businesses often support prizes that appeal to older students. While movie passes or gift certificates are enticing, one high school gathered donations to hire a limousine for the prom as a grand prize.

Special Server Days

Students of all ages are surprised to see a local sports star, television personality, or policeman serving breakfast. Schools also invite celebrity chefs to create special meals. Either way, the guest adds excitement to the morning, and promotional planning can increase visibility of the event. In Lawrence, Massachusetts, the Food Service Director invited the new mayor for breakfast. Since the local newspaper and television station were also on hand, this event attracted more students to breakfast.

Books and Breakfast

This program promotes reading during breakfast time. Many schools that serve breakfast in the cafeteria have older students or adult volunteers read with young children (seniors add a wonderful intergenerational aspect to this idea). Others coordinate book marts during the morning. Breakfast in the classroom provides time for students to read on their own, or for teachers to read with children. Dr. Seuss's birthday (March 2) falls during National School Breakfast Week and some schools combine classroom reading with the unique menu of *Green Eggs and Ham*. A modern version of this promotion might include educational videos.

Community Support

Food Service Directors may plan and implement SBP promotions, but support from local businesses and civic groups often enhance the program. For instance, a group of business leaders may donate money, but a local company may donate prizes or specialty food items. Churches, synagogues and civic groups may serve as volunteers who supervise growing breakfast programs or arrange for activities.

Transportation --

For many schools, especially those in rural areas, bus schedules prevent children from arriving in time to eat breakfast. In New Hampshire, reportedly 59 percent of the schools have buses that arrive late (personal communication). Those who ride for an hour or more are likely to be hungry soon after school starts, even if they ate at home. Schools often allow students to eat breakfast before going to class if they arrive late due to school transportation. Other schools have policies that allow students to take simple items into the classroom, and some address the problem by rearranging the morning schedule so that breakfast occurs after the bell. One particularly creative solution is the use of cluster stops.

Cluster Stops

Clustering buses eliminates complicated bus routes by using neighborhood schools as drop and pick-up points. Children must go to the closest neighborhood school and, if they so choose, wait for buses to bring them to an alternative school. In Springfield, Massachusetts, the "clustering" of buses also addressed the issue of desegregation and allowed students to choose which school they would attend. In 1993, the Springfield School District combined cluster stops with the SBP so students could eat breakfast while they waited for the bus. Since Springfield experiences a high incidence of poverty, a Universal-SBP made sense, and eased the burdens of many. The majority of working parents in Springfield are employed in local factories or travel for work, so school buildings open at 6:30 or 7:00 a.m. Though supported by the superintendent and school board, parents were initially skeptical about the safety of their children. To address their concerns, the School Breakfast Coordinator invites parents to share breakfast with their children for only a small fee. Parents experience the program first hand, and feel more comfortable with the setting. By drawing adults into the school, many become involved with the school for the first time. Principals recognize the benefits of this, especially when parents who might otherwise not take an interest in school activities become participants in their child's education.

Parents are not the only ones to benefit from the cluster system. Many Springfield children arrive at school up to an hour before classes begin, so activities are organized for them. Youngsters play games, donated by a company, or use the time to receive tutoring or work on homework. The outcome is obvious as the schools have experienced a dramatic increase in participation over time. Initially, breakfast was served to approximately 5000-6000 students citywide; now approximately 11,000 students enjoy breakfast each day.

Cluster stops require much coordination and this model utilizes more staff, so principal support is crucial. However, Springfield was able to save on transportation costs due to non-complicated driving routes. The rise in reimbursements also allowed the food service director to raise the salaries of part-time personnel.

Staff --

Breakfast Coordinators

Staff appointed to the breakfast program can make contributions to the overall success of a SBP, as demonstrated in Springfield, Massachusetts. A breakfast coordinator is often a teacher or food service staff person who acts as a liaison between the food service director, administrators, teachers and parents. This person knows the culture of the school and is able to work with adults as well as students to design activities that appeal to youngsters and to enlist the support of others. In Boston, Massachusetts, grant funding provides a stipend to the breakfast coordinator. This helps cover that person's time for supervising students, developing materials or planning promotions, working with student groups or classrooms, and developing outreach campaigns for the community.

Creative Service Systems --

Breakfast in the Classroom

In 1994, the Minnesota legislature appropriated monies to fund universal school breakfast pilot programs in four schools; corporate funding supported two additional schools. Schools with as little as 33 percent of the students qualifying for free or reduced-price meals were able to participate. Analysts from the University of Minnesota documented improved test scores, increased attentiveness and behavior among students, and reduced absentee rates and trips to the nurse. Teachers supported the program and typically did not feel that breakfast in the classroom took away from "time on task" (Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning, 1998). Now, teachers who eat with their class use the time to teach manners and social skills, discuss food and nutrition, or simply bond with the individuals in their classrooms.

One major factor in the success of the ongoing Minnesota pilots (now in over 40 schools) is that schools integrate breakfast into the school day. By serving children in the classroom, participation rose to 93 percent (Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning, 1998). Food service directors work with the teachers to identify the best method for offering the program. Some students still go straight from the bus to the cafeteria; others go with their class to the cafeteria and listen to morning announcements during breakfast, and some classrooms eat breakfast after hearing the announcements. Younger students may read during breakfast, and sixth-grade students in one school watch a morning news program.

In Maryland, the Marion Sarah Payton Elementary School used to serve breakfast in the cafeteria as part of the school day, but experienced much confusion as students moved from the classroom to the cafeteria. The school now serves breakfast in the classroom to 78 percent of the student body. Staff use a streamlined system in which non-perishable foods items (cereal, disposable service ware) are packed in bins in the afternoon for easy transport to classrooms the next morning. Cold items such as juice and milk are delivered shortly thereafter. As students enter the classroom, they take the breakfast items and the teacher checks their name, which is coded for reimbursement purposes. By 9:00 a.m. all service items are disposed of in trash bags and placed outside the door for collection by custodial staff.

High participation rates are not the only benefit of classroom meals. Since all children have easy access to breakfast, food service directors do not have to plan elaborate or costly promotional activities. Surveys conducted by individual schools suggest that children and parents like the program, and food service directors often feel that they have more support than ever before, partly because people appreciate the new program.

Breakfast Carts

A variation of breakfast in the classroom is the use of breakfast carts. In Tacoma, Washington, 11 elementary schools and one middle school offer Universal-SBP through the use of "Cambro" carts that are stationed in the hallways and hold the proper temperature of food. Students enter the building, take breakfast items from a designated cart, and bring the food to the classroom. Simple hand-held items are served to reduce messiness.

When designing this program, the food service director partnered with the schools and set parameters for schools wishing to trial breakfast in the classroom. The main criteria were full support and commitment from the individual school and its teachers. Of note, serving breakfast during the school day eliminates issues of supervision because, according to this Food Service Director, "once the bell rings, everyone is on duty." Teacher surveys also indicate that students have more energy, fewer headaches and stomachaches, and less fatigue.

Menu Choices

The school makes for a convenient breakfast locale, but the menu ultimately determines whether or not students eat. Many food service directors find that participation increases when creative menu items are offered, or when hot meals are served. Some reserve hot foods for special occasions, while others recognize the need to address outside competition by serving egg sandwiches or pancakes on a regular basis. As noted earlier, guest chefs can add creative flair and excitement to the meal. When food service directors involve students in the menu planning process, they maximize participation by giving students ownership over the program, and by assuring that popular food options will be available. Overall, by serving foods that appeal to students, schools notice that more children participate and less food is wasted.

Conclusion

The Universal School Breakfast Program maximizes participation and has positive impacts on academic outcomes. By providing crucial nutrients to children, the program insures that all students have the opportunity to learn at their fullest potential. Teachers appreciate better behavior and attentiveness, and students have more energy to learn.

From an administrative viewpoint, the Universal-SBP can simplify morning mealtime, relieving stress for food service workers, students, *and* parents. The rise in reimbursements that results from greater participation rates can cover the cost of meals served to students who are able to pay, especially in schools with higher proportions of students qualified for free and reduced-price meals. In fact, many food service directors report that districts use the increased reimbursements to upgrade food service equipment, cover staff salaries, or provide pay raises.

The key to success rests with the overall level of support in the district and within each school, especially among administrators. Supportive school environments generally ensure collaboration

among staff, and ideally this extends into the community. Numerous options are available to districts in creating universal free breakfast programs. Once people understand the benefits of a Universal-SBP, they are likely to embrace this program in order to improve academic outcomes among students.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful for the research assistance of Edith Cheung who conducted the survey of state School Breakfast Programs, compiled the results, and provided other technical assistance on this report.

APPENDIX 1

Alternative Reporting Methods -- Provisions

The USDA has three options through which schools may reduce administrative burden via paperwork reduction. These Provisions typically are reserved for high need schools that serve 80 percent of student meals at free or reduced cost. In general, the Provision system calls for schools to establish student eligibility for free, reduced- or full-price meals during a base year. The school then uses that information for reimbursement purposes for a set period of time after the base year (instead of collecting and randomly verifying applications annually, and taking daily meal counts by payment category). Schools still maintain files of applications, but submit reimbursement claims each month using percentages established in the "base year" to the school food authority (usually the Department of Education), as required by the USDA. The government provides commodity assistance at the same level as that received by the school during the base year.

The overall benefit of the Provision method is that it greatly eases administrative burden, and schools or districts can reduce labor costs. Since meals are served at no charge to any child, the system increases participation rates and reimbursements received. However, there are two financial risks involved. First, the school forfeits money that would have been collected from students able to pay a reduced- or full-price for meals. Second, since applications are collected only during the base year, these applications can be reviewed during an audit in any subsequent year. If a discrepancy is found, cost adjustments must be made back to the time of the base year. Schools fear that they could owe money, for instance, should it have classified a "reduced-price" student as "free" in the base year. Fortunately, discrepancies are usually balanced between owing and gaining reimbursements, so this is not considered a major risk.

Provision I

This option allows schools to collect applications and certify students eligible for free meals every other school year. Traditional counting and claiming procedures are followed, and applications are still collected from students eligible for reduced-price meals. At least 80 percent of the students enrolled at the school must be eligible for free and reduced-price meals in order to use Provision I (7CFR, 245.9 (a)(1) and (2)).

The main purpose of this Provision is to reduce the burden for households below 130 percent of poverty (thus eligible for free meals). Households that do not meet the criteria for free meals must continue to submit applications each year, and the school must verify the eligibility status of students. Provision I schools may choose whether or not to use a pricing program for students that do not qualify for free meals, so financial risk is minimal.

Provision II

The most popular option, Provision II begins with a four-year cycle that can be extended an additional four years if the socioeconomic status of the community remains stable or declines (Public Law 105-336). Of note, Provision II formally ran on a three-year cycle, followed by a five-year extension, and many schools are still on this cycle. Either way, meals are served at no charge to all students during the base year, while applications are collected to determine each child's eligibility status. The school food service department absorbs any costs associated with

serving all meals for free, and schools may apply Provision II to breakfast, lunch, or both meals. Daily meal counts are taken by category (free, reduced or paid), and claiming percentages are established for each month and submitted to the state agency as usual. In the subsequent "non-base" years, the percentage calculated for the corresponding month in the base year is applied to the total number of meals served that month in order to determine the number of meals served in each category (7CFR, 245.9(b)(1) and (2)). Daily meal counts by category are *not* required.

Example of Calculating Meal Claims for Provision II in Non-Base Years *

1. Determine percentage of breakfasts served by category in March 1998 (base-year):

Category	Number Served		Total Meals	Percentage
Free	8800	÷	11,000	0.800
Reduced	600	÷	11,000	0.055
Paid	1600	÷	11,000	0.145

2. Determine the total number of breakfasts served in March 1999 (non-base year):
= 12,400

3. Multiply category percentages from the base year by the current month's total:

Category	Percentage		Total		Current Meal Count by Category **
Free	0.800	x	12,400	=	9,920
Reduced	0.055	x	12,400	=	682
Free	0.145	x	12,400	=	1,798
12,400					

** use current meal count per category for reimbursement claims in non-base years

*Adapted from the Special Assistance Guidance Manual, Arizona Department of Education

The primary advantage of Provision II is that it eliminates paperwork in the non-base years. Meal service is improved because daily counts are eliminated and children can move through the cafeteria line more quickly. These two factors can lead to labor cost savings given the simplified system.

The downside relates to the financial risk involved due to forfeited income from reduced-price and paid meals. As such, this system, like all Provision options, works best when the school serves a high proportion of free and reduced-price meals. In addition, administrators may have difficulty collecting applications in future base years since all students receive free meals regardless of their ability to pay. Some schools may even find that it is difficult to collect applications during the base year, since schools must announce that no student will be charged. Food service directors recommend informing people that the universal breakfast service will occur on a trial basis to encourage the return of applications. Others set deadlines or offer incentives for children who return their application.

Provision III

This Provision allows schools to collect money for reduced-price and paid meals during the base year, but requires that all meals be provided at no charge during the subsequent four school years (Section 111, Public Law 103-448). This four-year cycle can be extended for an additional four years if the socioeconomic status of the community remains stable (USDA Policy Memorandum, September 8, 1995). Like Provision II, daily meal counts are not required; reimbursement

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

calculations are based on the participation and proportion of meals served per category in the base year. Again, schools may choose to apply Provision III to breakfast, lunch or both.

In contrast to Provision II, the pricing program may continue during this base year, which relieves some of the financial risk of serving all meals at no charge. Reimbursements in subsequent years are adjusted for enrollment changes and inflation only. Since reimbursements are provided at the same level as the base year, that year should represent future years for the number of meal service operating days, and ideally should reflect maximum participation (in the example, the participation rate is 94 percent).

Example for Calculating Meal Claims for Provision III Non-Base Years *

1. Take the number of breakfasts served in each category in March, 1998 (base-year):

Free	4,000
Reduced	500
Paid	200

2. Determine the change in enrollment from March 1998 to March 1999:

Current enrollment	5150
Base-year enrollment	5000
Change	+150

150 ÷ 5000 = 0.03 x 100 = 3% increase in enrollment

3. Instead of taking meal counts, use the base-year counts and adjust for changes in enrollment:

Category	Base-Year Meals (step 1)		Enrollment Change (step 2)		Current Meal Count**
Free	4,000	x	1.03	=	4120
Reduced	500	x	1.03	=	515
Paid	200	x	1.03	=	206

** use current meal count per category for reimbursement claims in non-base years

*Adapted from the Special Assistance Guidance Manual, Arizona Department of Education

Provision III reduces the burden of completing applications for free and reduced-price eligible households, and eliminates the verification process in non-base years. It also allows for simplified meal service and reduced labor costs since meal counts are completely eliminated and no cashier is necessary. Again, schools risk financial losses from reduced- and full-price meals, and may find it difficult to collect applications in subsequent base years. An additional disadvantage of Provision III is that there are no reimbursement adjustments for increases in participation. Reimbursements are only adjusted for changes in enrollment, so if the school successfully raises participation rates in non-base years, they will not benefit from increased reimbursements.

States that Use Provisions

The following chart demonstrates the extent to which public schools in each state use provisions, based on a survey conducted by the Center (data reported by state departments of education from December 1998 through February 1999). Nationwide, over 3100 schools use some type of Provision to serve breakfast at no cost to children. The following states do not have any schools

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that use the Provision system: Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Mississippi, Nevada, Hew Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, West Virginia and Wyoming.

There are only six states that use Provision I:

- Alaska
- California
- Illinois
- New Jersey
- New York
- North Carolina

Many states (34) use Provision II. California, New York and Texas have the most schools using this system, while those with the highest percentage (19-39%) of school breakfast programs operating under Provision II are:

- Oregon (39%)
- New Mexico (24%)
- Nebraska (23%)
- Arizona (20%)
- District of Columbia (19%)

Only 11 states use provision III. Those with the highest percentage (42-48%) of school breakfast programs using Provision III are the District of Columbia and Alaska; the remaining states have only a few schools that use this option:

- Alaska
- Arizona
- California
- District of Columbia
- Georgia
- Illinois
- Minnesota
- New Jersey
- Oklahoma
- Tennessee
- Utah

State	Schools with SBP	Schools using Provision I	% Schools	Schools using Provision II	% Schools	Schools using Provision III	% Schools
AL	961	-	-	8	0.83%	-	-
AK	1092	-	-	10	0.92%	-	-
AS	175	9	5.14%	27	15.43%	75	42.86%
AZ	122	-	-	24	19.67%	6	4.92%
CA	5944	117	1.97%	428	7.20%	74	1.24%
CO	909	-	-	5	0.55%	-	-
CT	460	-	-	68	14.78%	-	-
DC	134	-	-	25	18.66%	65	48.51%
DE	176	-	-	-	-	-	-
FL	2466	-	-	59	2.39%	-	-
GA	1779	-	-	152	8.54%	2	0.11%
HI	230	-	-	-	-	-	-
IA	1081	-	-	6	0.56%	-	-

State	Schools with SBP	Schools using Provision I	% Schools	Schools using Provision II	% Schools	Schools using Provision III	% Schools
ID	419	-	-	-	-	-	-
IL	1891	79	4.18%	37	1.96%	20	1.06%
IN	422	-	-	6	1.42%	-	-
KS	1273	-	-	3	0.24%	-	-
KY	1308	-	-	15	1.15%	-	-
LA	1575	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA	1046	-	-	52	4.97%	-	-
MD	1190	-	-	43	3.61%	-	-
ME	503	-	-	8	1.59%	-	-
MI	2621	-	-	-	-	-	-
MN	1228	-	-	52	4.23%	5	0.41%
MO	1802	-	-	-	-	-	-
MS	733	-	-	-	-	-	-
MT	264	-	-	5	1.89%	-	-
NC	2075	1		-	-	-	-
ND	198	-	-	7	3.54%	-	-
NE	366	-	-	83	22.68%	-	-
NH	300	-	-	-	-	-	-
NJ	683	42	6.15%	26	3.81%	1	0.15%
NM	600	-	-	143	23.83%	-	-
NV	314	-	-	-	-	-	-
NY	5120	13	0.25%	561	10.96%	-	-
OH	1821	-	-	135	7.41%	-	-
OK	1571	-	-	-	-	20	1.27%
OR	251	-	-	99	39.44%	-	-
PA	2411	-	-	3	0.12%	-	-
RI	165	-	-	-	-	-	-
SC	1130	-	-	-	-	-	-
SD	323	-	-	10 districts	n/a	-	-
TN	1397	-	-	-	-	3	0.21%
TX	6500	-	-	453	6.97%	-	-
UT	458	-	-	5	1.09%	2	0.44%
VA	1527	-	-	39	2.55%	-	-
VT	234	-	-	-	-	-	-
WA	1582	-	-	5	0.32%	-	-
WI	715	-	-	16	2.24%	-	-
WV	764	-	-	-	-	-	-
WY	141	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**62450**	**261**	**0.42%**	**2608**	**4.18%**	**273**	**0.44%**

APPENDIX 2

States with Financial Incentives

State	Grant Funding	Added State Reimbursements for Meals Served
CA	$800,000 start up funds available at a maximum of $10,000 if >30% meals served at free and/or reduced-price. Must maintain SBP for 3 years.	$0.1209/ free and reduced-price breakfast in public schools.
CT	$1,323,092 available for severe need schools at $3,000 anually.	$0.10/ breakfast.
FL		State meal reimbursements (Breakfast Supplement Funds) for elementary districts of $10,624,349 in both FY98-99. Amount varies and depends on the number of Free and Reduced meals served.
IL		State gives $0.12/ free breakfast served, allocating $3,443,000 in both FY98-99.
IA		State gives $.045/ breakfast until funds are depleted.
MA	$1 million for expansion; $500,000 given for Universal-SBP pilot in 8 districts (51 schools).	State covers the cost above federal reimbursement.
MD	$90,000 in state funds available for "Meals for Achievement" grants	$0.13 / free and reduced-price breakfast in non-severe and $0.475/free and reduced-price breakfast in severe-need schools.
MI		State provides $4.3 million per year for school breakfasts to cover the cost above federal reimbursements and revenues.
MN	$1,037,000 for Targeted Breakfast Grants to 41 schools, plus $15,000 for outreach, in FY98-99.	
NY		$0.11/free, $0.17/reduced-price, $0.0025/full-price meal. State covers costs above federal reimbursements and revenues for first-time programs in public schools.
OH	Rural school start-up grants available.	$.10/ breakfast for total of $5 million in FY98-99.
PA		$0.10/breakfast, $0.04/lunch; plus $0.02/lunch if breakfast is also served, or $0.04 if >20% children participate in SBP.
RI	$250,000 for supervision expenses, FY99.	
VT	$50,000 for SBP and SFSP start-up and expansion grants, FY99.	
WA	$221,000 for SBP start-up and expansion grants (Meals for Kids).	$0.15/ free and reduced-price breakfast given to public schools (total $4.5 million state reimbursements).
WI	$150,000 for Breakfast start-up grants at maximum of $10,000/district/year.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 3

Calculation of Breakfast Costs

Cost-Benefit Analysis Example – 1*

Step 1 – Determine Income

	Meals Served	USDA Reimbursement (assumes severe-need)		Reimbursement Received
Free	_____	x $1.2775	=	_____
Reduced	_____	x $0.9775	=	_____
Paid	_____	x $0.200	=	_____
		Total Income		$_____

Step 2 – Determine Costs

	Cost/Meal		Number Meals		Total Cost
Food/Supplies	$_____	x	_____	=	_____
Labor/Benefits	$_____	x	_____	=	_____
Indirect Costs	$_____	x	_____	=	_____
			Total Expenses		$_____

Step 3 – Determine Ability to Cover Costs

Total Income		$_____
Total Expenses	-	$_____
Operational Gain (loss)		$_____

*Adapted from the California Food Policy Advocates "Cost Analysis Worksheet"

Cost-Benefit Analysis Example – 2*

Step 1 – Determine Income

	Total Number of Students/Category	Reimbursement (assumes severe-need)		Totals
Free	_____	x	$1.2775	_____
Reduced	_____	x	$0.9775	_____
Paid	_____	x	$0.2000	_____
Total Enrollment	_____		**Total Reimbursement**	_____

Step 2 – Determine Average Reimbursement per Meal

Total Reimbursement ÷ Total Student Enrollment = Average Reimbursement/Meal

Step 3 – Determine Average Cost per Meal (refer to example 1, step 2)

Step 4 – Determine Ability to Cover Costs

Average Reimbursement/Meal		$ _____
Cost/Meal	-	$ _____
Operational Gain (loss)/meal		$ _____

* Adapted from the Tacoma, Washington School District

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References:

Brown JL, and Pollitt E. Malnutrition, Poverty and Intellectual Development. *Scientific American*. Feb, 1996, 38-43.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Pediatric Nutrition Surveillance, 1997 full report.* Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1998.

Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy. Statement on the Link Between Nutrition and Cognitive Development in Children. *Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy*, 1998. Tufts University, Medford, MA.

Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy. Central Fall's Kids First: A Case Study. *Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy*, 1996. Tufts University, Medford, MA.

Code of Federal Regulations, 7 CFR 220, United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, School Breakfast Program Regulations, Jan. 1, 1998.

Code of Federal Regulations, 7 CFR 245, United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Determining eligibility for Free and reduced Price Meals and Free Milk in Schools, Jan. 1, 1998.

Cook JT, Ohri-Vachaspati P, Kelly GL. Evaluation of a Universally-Free School Breakfast Program Demonstration Project, Central Falls, Rhode Island. *Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy;* 1996.

Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, Life Sciences Research Office. Prepared for the Interagency Board for Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research. 1995. Third Report on Nutrition Monitoring in the United States: Volume 1. US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.

Friedman BJ and Hurd-Crixell SL. Nutrient intake of children eating school breakfast. *JADA* 1999:99(2):219-221.

Kennedy E, Davis C. US Department of Agriculture School Breakfast Program. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1998;67(4)(Suppl):798-803S.

Kleinman RE, Murphy JM, Little M, Pagano M, Wehler CA, Regal K, Jellinek MS. Hunger in Children in the United States: Potential Behavioral and Emotional Correlates. *Pediatrics* 1998;101(1):E3.

Minnesota Department of Children Families and Learning. School Breakfast Programs Energizing the Classroom, 1998. St. Paul, MN.

Morley R and Lucas A. Nutrition and Cognitive Development. *Brit Med Bulletin* 1997;53(1):123-34.

Munoz KA, Krebs-Smith SM, Ballard-Barbash R, Cleveland LE. Food intakes of US children and adolescents compared with recommendations. *Pediatrics* 1997;100(3):323-29.

Murphy JM, Pagano ME, Nachmani J, Sperling P, Kane S, Kleinman RE. The Relationship of School Breakfast to Psychosocial and Academic Fundctioning. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 1998;152:899-907.

Myers AF, Sampson AE, Weitzman M, Rogers BL, Kayne H. School Breakfast Program and School Performance. *Am J Diseases of Child* 1989;143:1234-39.

Nicklas TA, O'Neil CE, Berenson GS. Nutrient contribution of breakfast, secular trends, and the role of ready-to-eat cereals: a review of the data from the Bogalusa Heart Study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1998;67(4)(Suppl):757-63S.

Pollitt E (Ed). Breakfast, cognition, and school learning. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1998;67(4)(Suppl).

Pollitt E. Does breakfast make a difference in school? *JADA* 1995;95(10):1134-39.

Pollitt E, Cueto S, Jacoby E. Fasting and cognition in well- and undernourished schoolchildren: a review of three experimental studies. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1998;67(4)(Suppl):772-8S.

Siega-Riz AM, Popkin BM, Carson T. Trends in breakfast consumption for children in the United States from 1965 to 1991. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1998;67(4)(Suppl):748-56S.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Household Food Security in the United States in 1995: Summary Report of the Food Security Measurement Project. Washington DC: USDA, Food and Consumer Service, Office of Analysis and Evaluation, 1997.

Vaisman N, Voet H, Akivis A, and Vakil E. Effect of Breakfast Timing on the Cognitive Functions of Elementary School Students. *Arch Ped and Adol Med.* 1996;150(10):1089-92.

Whitney E, Rolfes S. Understanding Nutrition, 6th Edition, 1993; West Publishing, Co., St. Paul, MN.

ABOUT THE CENTER

Established at Tufts University in 1990, the Center on Hunger and Poverty analyzes public policy alternatives to reduce hunger and domestic poverty, and to enhance the productive capacities of American families. The Center carries out research and analyses, and works with governmental leaders and the media to develop a greater understanding of policy alternatives facing the nation.

Center on Hunger and Poverty
Tufts University
11 Curtis Avenue
Medford, MA 02155
Tel: 617-627-3956
Fax: 617-627-3020

CENTER MEMBERSHIP

1999 Membership to the Center on Hunger and Poverty includes all publications, reports, analyses and updates produced in 1999 (regardless of when you sign up), as well as the monthly *State Works* newsletter. Topics include national and state policies concerning hunger, poverty and welfare issues, and timely information on state policies and programs. Call the Center for a list of previous publications.

1999 Membership Rates (select one)

Organization Membership	$40.00	_____
Individual Membership	$30.00	_____
Limited Income/Student	$20.00	_____

Name: _____
Title: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Phone: _____ Fax: _____
Email: _____

Mail membership form and check to address at top of page.